

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/717,869	HUUSKONEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	José A. Fortuna	1731	

All Participants:
Status of Application: _____

 (1) José A. Fortuna.

(3) _____.

 (2) Timothy E. Levstik.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 24 January 2005
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

6 and 9

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet
Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called applicants' attorney to change, what it seems to be a typographical error, on claims 6 and 9, lines 3 and 4 respectively, where the surface roughness units are given in millimeters, (mm) instead of micrometers, (μm). Mr. Levstik admitted that it was a typographical error and that the unit should be changed to μm . Mr. Levstik indicated also that he changed the same mistake in claim 1, but missed them on the new claims.